

REMARKS

With claims 126-205 previously pending, with this amendment claims 127-129, 131, 139-140, 142-144, 147-149, 151, 159-160, 162-164, 167-169, 171, 179-180, 182-184, 187-189, 191, 199-200 and 202-204 have been cancelled, and claims 206-277 have been added. Further, claims 130, 132, 141, 146, 150, 152, 161, 166, 170, 172, 181, 186, 190, 192 and 201 have been amended as detailed to below.

Objection To Title

The Office Action indicates that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The Office Action suggests a new title. In response, Applicants have amended the title to more concisely reflect the currently claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

Section 102 Rejection

Claims 126-205 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Crisler et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,278,883, hereinafter Crisler). The Office Action points out disclosure from Crisler as it relates to individual groups of claims to support the rejection. Based on the following remarks addressing each of the specific groups of claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

a. Claims 126, 141, 146, 161, 166, 181, 186 and 201

Regarding claims 126, 141, 146, 161, 166, 181, 186 and 201, the Office Action states that Crisler discloses:

“[A] method and apparatus (see figure 1) of communicating data comprising:
transmitting a first signal from a communication controller to at least one network node including a first node, the first signal including information relating to a specific

timeslot in which the first node may transmit a first request signal to the communication controller (see figure 4, column 6 and lines 55-61) ;

receiving the first request signal transmitted from the first node to the communication controller in response to the first signal, said first request signal including a request for allocation of time for transmitting a specified amount of data from the first node to the communication controller (see column 5 and lines 18-27);

transmitting a second signal from the communication controller to the first node in response to the first request signal, said second signal allocating at least one timeslot to the first node for transmitting the data to the communication controller; and

receiving the data transmitted from the first node to the communication controller in response to the second signal (see column 5 and lines 25-45.”

In contrast with the Office Action, however, Crisler does not disclose the first element “transmitting a first signal ... including information relating to a specific timeslot in which the first node may transmit a first request signal,” either in figure 4, column 6 and lines 55-61 as indicated by the Office Action, or elsewhere.

In Crisler, Fig. 4 and in col. 6, lines 55-61, the controller (135) is described as configuring the timeslots (415), and then waiting to receive requests (415). No mention is made of the controller (135) sending a signal telling the requestors what timeslots they can transmit in. Referring to Fig. 3 and col. 6, lines 25 of Crisler that further describe operation of the communication unit controller (115) - “the controller waits (316) for the occurrence of a random access time slot on the inbound communication channel. When a random access time slot is found, the controller chooses (317) one of the two random access subslots in which to transmit a reservation packet.” Thus, the communication unit controller appears to already know where the random access time slots are located without receiving any message from the controller. The fact that the location of the subslots can be known can be inferred from Fig. 2A and Fig. 2B in Crisler that show the consistent, or known, locations 230 for the two random access subslots.

Applicant’s specification initially indicates in page 9, lines 9-20 with reference to Fig. 13 that its requests are transmitted on a frequency f_4 with a first time slot assigned to a first node, a second time slot assigned to a second node, etc. Further in Applicant’s

page 12, lines 20-22 with reference to Fig. 4 it is disclosed that “a sending pager unit 22 transmits, in its assigned time slot, a request signal on frequency f4 when the sending pager unit 22 desires to send a message.” As indicated in Applicant’s page 19, lines 3-6, the timeslot is assigned by a communications packet sent from a controller to the pager or requester. As indicated above, no such specific message in Crisler assigns a timeslot, as claimed. Accordingly, claims 126, 141, 146, 161, 166, 181, 186 and 201 are believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler under 35 U.S.C. 102.

New claims 206, 224, 242 and 260 are believed allowable based at least on their dependency on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186. New claims 206, 224, 242 and 260 further add language indicating “the specific timeslot in which the first node may transmit as identified by the first signal is assigned exclusively to the first node.” This further contrasts with Crisler, which discloses “two random access subslots” in which any requester with data to transmit may place a request. See col. 6, line 31-34 of Crisler. Claims 206, 224, 242 and 260 are, thus, further believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler.

New claims 207, 225, 243 and 261 are further believed allowable based at least on their dependency on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186. New claims 207, 253, 243 and 261 further add language indicating “the specific timeslot in which the first node may transmit as identified by the first signal can be assigned to another one of the nodes.” See Applicant’s page 26, lines 18-25. Crisler in contrast discloses “random access” slots, and no disclosure in Crisler is provided for sending a message from a controller assigning the time slots, as claimed. Claims 207, 225, 243 and 261 are, thus, believed allowable over Crisler.

Claims 141, 161, 181 and 201 are further believed allowable based at least on their dependency on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186. New claims 141, 161, 181 and 201 further add language from both new claims 206, 224, 242 and 260 that “the

specific timeslot is assigned exclusively to the first node” and from new claims 209, 227, 245 and 263 that “the specific timeslot is one of a series of timeslots where the network nodes can transmit requests, the series of timeslots occurring repeatedly without being disabled during operation of the communication controller,” that are believed allowable over Crisler as explained with respect to claims 209, 227, 245 and 263 to follow. Claims 141, 161, 181 and 201 are, thus, believed further allowable as not anticipated over Crisler.

b. Claims 127, 147, 167 and 187

Regarding claims 127, 147, 167 and 187, the Office Action states:

“Crisler further teaches that the data received from the first one in response to the second signal is provided in the at least one time slot allocated (see column 5 and lines 33-36.)”

Claims 127, 147, 167 and 187 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot.

c. Claims 128, 148, 163, 168, 188 and 203

Regarding claims 128, 148, 163, 168, 188 and 203, the Office Action states:

“Crisler further teaches that the data comprises both message and protocol information (see column 5 and lines 33-36.)”

Claims 128, 148, 163, 168, 188 and 203 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot.

d. Claims 129-131, 142-144, 149-151, 164, 169-171, 183, 184, 189-191 and 204

Regarding claims 129-131, 142-144, 149-151, 164, 169-171, 183, 184, 189-191 and 204, the Office Action states:

“Crisler further teaches that the data comprises a plurality of successive packets, wherein the specified amount of data requested comprises a total number of successive packets, wherein each of the successive packets includes both message and protocol information (see figure 2B, column 5 and lines 33-36, 54-60).”

Claims 129, 131, 142-144, 149, 151, 164, 169, 171, 183, 184, 189, 191 and 204 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to those claims.

Initially regarding claims 130, 150, 170 and 190, Applicants maintain that it is allowable over Crisler based at least on their dependence on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186. Further, claims 130, 150, 170 and 190 claim that the “specified amount of data comprises a total number of the successive packets.” Crisler in col. 5, lines 33-36 and 54-60, as referenced by the Office Action, indicates that data to be transmitted is measured in “timeslots.” Line 36 in Crisler further only mentions a single packet. No mention is made in Crisler of measuring a “number of successive packets.” Accordingly, claims 130, 150, 170 and 190 are further believed allowable as not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102 by Crisler.

e. Claims 132, 152, 162, 172, 182, 192 and 202

Regarding claims 132, 152, 162, 172, 182, 192 and 202, the Office Action states:

“Crisler further teaches that the specific timeslot in which the first node may transmit the first request signal is one of a series of timeslots occurring repeatedly after transmission of the first signal from the communication controller (see column 2 and lines 55-65.)”

Claims 162, 182 and 202 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to those claims.

Initially regarding claims 132, 152, 172 and 192, these claims are believed allowable over Crisler based at least on their dependence on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186.

Further, Applicants have amended claims 132, 152, 172 and 192 to claim that “the first request signal is one of a series of timeslots where the network nodes can transmit requests occurring repeatedly after transmission of the first signal from the communication controller and continuing after receipt of the first request signal transmitted to the communication controller.” This is illustrated in Applicant’s Fig. 6. In contrast, Crisler discloses that after receipt of a valid request, the controller switches from a first (random access) mode to a second (reserved) mode where a new timeslot format 240 is provided in which the reservation packets 230 that includes the two random access subslot request fields are no longer repetitively transmitted. See Crisler, col. 5, lines 25-29 and Figs. 2A-2C. Accordingly, the timeslots for a request do not repeat in Crisler after “transmission of the second signal,” as claimed by Applicant. Claims 132, 152, 172 and 192 are, thus, further believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler.

New claims 208, 209, 226, 227, 244, 245, 262 and 263 further define over Crisler by indicating that the timeslots occur repeatedly, with claims 208, 226, 244 and 262 adding that the timeslots recur “throughout operation of the communication controller,” and claims 209, 227, 245 and 263 adding that the timeslots recur “without being disabled during operation of the communication controller.” Accordingly, claims 208, 209, 226, 227, 244, 245, 262 and 263 are further believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler.

New claims 210, 228, 246 and 264 are believed allowable based at least on its dependency on respective claims 132, 152, 172 and 192. New claims 210, 228, 246 and

264 further add language indicating “wherein at least some of the series of timeslots occurring repeatedly are each exclusively assigned to a single one of the nodes for providing a request to transmit data.” As indicated above with respect to claims 206, 224, 242 and 260, Crisler uses “two random access” slots and does not disclose assignment of timeslots to any node. Claims 210, 228, 246 and 264 are, thus, believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler.

f. Claims 133, 134, 145, 152, 165, 173, 185, 193, and 205

Regarding claims 133, 134, 145, 152 (Applicants note that this is believed to be 153 instead of 152), 165, 173, 185, 193 and 205, the Office Action states that Crisler further teaches:

“transmitting a third signal from the communication controller to at least one network node including a second node (see figure 1 and item 101), the third signal including information relating to a second specific timeslot in which the second node may transmit a second request signal to the communication controller; and

receiving the second request signal transmitted from the second node to the communication controller in response to the third signal, wherein the second request signal is received from the second node by the communication controller after transmission of the second signal allocating the at least one timeslot to the first node for transmitting the data, and prior to receipt of all the data from the first node (see column 5 and line 66-column 6 and line 7).”

Initially regarding claims 133, 153, 173 and 193, Applicants maintain that they are allowable over Crisler based on its dependence on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186. Further, in contract with the Office Action statement, Crisler does not teach that a second request signal can be received “after transmission of the second signal ... and prior to receipt of all the data from the first node.” As indicated with respect to claim 132 above, after a valid request signal is accepted, the controller switches from a first (random access) mode to a second (reserved) mode where a new timeslot format 240 is

provided in which the reservation packets 230, and the two random access subslot request fields are no longer transmitted. See Crisler, col. 5, lines 25-29 and Figs. 2A-2C. Accordingly, the second request signal cannot be received until after transmission of data from the first node in the reserved mode (the Crisler system must switch back to a random access mode for further requests). Claims 133, 153, 173 and 193 are, thus, believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler.

Claim 134 is believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler based at least on its dependency on claim 126.

Claims 145, 165, 185 and 205 include similar language to respective claims 133, 153, 173 and 193 and, thus, believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler based on the argument above with respect to those claims.

g. Claims 135-137, 155-157, 175-177 and 195-197

Claims 135-137, 155-157, 175-177 and 195-197 are believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler based at least on their dependency on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186.

h. Claims 138, 158, 178 and 198

Claims 138, 158, 178 and 198 are is believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler based at least on their dependency on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186.

i. Claims 139, 159, 179 and 199

Claims 139, 159, 179 and 199 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot.

j. Claims 140, 154, 160, 174, 180, 194 and 200

Claims 140, 160, 180, and 200 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to those claims.

Claims 154, 174 and 194 are believed allowable based at least on their dependency on respective claims 146, 166 and 186.

k. New Claims 211-212, 229-230, 247-248 and 265-266

New Claims 211, 229, 247 and 265 claim that the nodes include a pressure sensitive writing pad. Nodes containing a pressure sensitive writing pad are disclosed in Applicant's specification in page 25, lines 1-3. Crisler is not believed to disclose such a pressure sensitive writing pad. Claims 211, 229, 247 and 265 are thus believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler based on claiming the pressure sensitive writing pad, as well as based on their dependency on respective claims 126, 146, 166 and 186.

New Claims 212, 230, 248 and 266 claim that the nodes include an alphanumeric graphics display. Nodes containing an alphanumeric graphics display pad are disclosed in Applicant's specification in page 25, lines 1-3. Crisler is not believed to disclose such an alphanumeric graphics display. Claims 212, 230, 248 and 266 are thus believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler based at least on claiming the alphanumeric graphics display, as well as based on their dependency on claims 126, 146, 166 and 186.

l. New Claims 213-223, 231-241, 249-259 and 267-277

New Claims 213-223, 231-241, 249-259 and 267-277 claim that a node makes multiple reservation requests. Such multiple requests are disclosed in Application's specification in page 25, line 8 through page 30, line 26 relating to operation when a

pager travels into the operation region of a new controller. Crisler is not believed to disclose a multiple reservation request procedure claimed in claims 213-223, 231-241, 249-259 and 267-277. Claims 213-223, 231-241, 249-259 and 267-277 are thus believed allowable as not anticipated by Crisler.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the claims of the present application are now all believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due with this response. Should a fee be due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 06-1325.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/25/05

By: Thomas A. Ward
Thomas A. Ward
Reg. No. 35,732

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800